PP4

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,502	06/09/2000	Robert L. Piccioni	067555.0102	2473

7590   09/30/2003

Darren W Collins Esq
Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
KANG, PAUL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/590,502	PICCIONI, ROBERT L.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul H Kang	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 17-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 17-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Brown, US Pat. No. 6,173,284 B1, in view of Langsenkamp et al., US Pat. No. 5,912,947,

and further in view of Chan et al., US Pat. App. Pub. No. US 2002/0019941 A1.

3.   As to claims 1 and 20, Brown teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Brown

teaches a system and method for situation tracking comprising:

a computer readable storage medium (Brown, col. 2, line 37 – col. 3, line 34 and col. 5,

lines 1-40);

an application stored in the computer readable storage medium and operable to:

receive an alert at a clearing house (a crime event is updated on the police

database; Brown, col. 1, line 21 – col. 2, line 10 and col. 12, lines 8-45);

handling a public safety event based on the alert (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col. 6,

line 6);

generate a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the public safety

event (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6);

determine a destination for the notification based on the subscriber profile
(Brown, col. 7, lines 31-63);

compare at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated
with the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the public safety event
(Brown, col. 7, line 31 – col. 8, line 49);

determine a match between the notify criteria and the event based on the
comparison (Brown, col. 7, line 31 – col. 8, line 49).

However, Brown does not explicitly teach a system and method to determine whether a
subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access to the matched events based on a
type associated with the subscriber profile.

In the same field of endeavor, Langsenkamp teaches a public notification system and
method wherein a type associated with the subscriber, such as residential subscriber, media, or
business, is used to determine subscriber access to the matched events (see Langsenkamp, col.
17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67 and col. 21, line 15-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have incorporated the type dependent access as taught by Langsenkamp,
into the emergency notification system of Brown for the purpose of efficiently controlling access
and message distribution.

Brown-Langsenkamp does not explicitly teach the type indicating whether a particular
portion of information concerning the matched public safety event is to be transmitted to the
subscriber in response to receiving a request to access the information from the subscriber. In the
same field of endeavor, Chan teaches restricting and allowing access to portions of information

based on an access control list (ACL) and user privilege information (Chan, page 1, paragraphs
0006-0007 and page 5, paragraph 0057 – page 6, paragraph 0068).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have incorporated the access control of Chan into the system of Brown-
Langsenkamp in order to enhance data access features.

4.   As to claim 2, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach determining a type associated with the
alert at the clearing house and wherein the event comprises a type indication, a location
indication, a time indication, a date indication, an access level indication and event details, the
access level indication indicating a plurality of subscribers whose requests to access information
concerning the matched public safety event are to be granted. (Brown, col. 7, lines 7-63 and
Chan, page 1, paragraphs 0006-0007).

5.   As to claim 3, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the subscriber profile comprising a
notify criteria, the notify criteria comprising a geographical distance around a first location,
wherein the event comprises a second location indication and wherein generating a notification
comprises determining whether the second location indication is within the geographic distance
of the first location (Langsenkamp, col. 12, line 1 – col. 13, line 36 and col. 16, lines 20-51).

6.   As to claim 4, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach associating at least one information need
with the subscriber profile, the information need comprising at least one event related item of

interest to the subscriber (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6; Sex-offender in a given

geographical area; Langsenkamp, col. 7, lines 7-26);

comparing the information need to at least one of the public safety events (Brown, col. 5,

line 1 – col. 6, line 6; Langsenkamp, col. 7, lines 7-26 and col. 21, lines 15-67); and

determining at least one notification to be generated in response to a result associated

with the comparison (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6; Langsenkamp, col. 7, lines 7-26 and

col. 21, lines 15-67).

7.   As to claim 5, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the result comprising a selected event

selected based on the comparison (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6; Langsenkamp, col. 7,

lines 7-26 and col. 21, lines 15-67).

8.   As to claim 7, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach generating the at least one notification

comprises generating at least one electronic mail message based on the selected event and

wherein the destination comprises an electronic mail address (Brown, col. 7, lines 7-63 and col.

11, lines 10-29).

9.   As to claim 8, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach comparing the information need

comprising determining whether the subscriber is allowed to access the event (Brown, col. 7,

lines 7-30 and Langsenkamp, col. 2, lines 30-56 and col. 17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67).

10.   As to claim 9, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach handling the event comprises updating

the event when the alert is updating an existing event and generating the event when the alert is

associated with a new event (Brown, col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line18 and col. 12, lines 8-45;

Langsenkamp, col. 21, lines 15-37).

11.   As to claims 10 and 11, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the subscriber profile

comprises a generic profile comprising a media generic profile (Langsenkamp, col. 17, line 64 –

col. 18, line 67).

12.   As to claim 12, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach generating the notification comprises:

        comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with

the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the public safety event (Brown, col. 7,

line 7 – col. 8, line 49);

        determining a match between the notify criteria and the public safety event based on the

comparison (Brown, col. 7, line 7 – col. 8, line 49); and

        determining whether a media subscriber associated with the media generic profile has

access to the matched events (Brown, col. 7, line 7 – col. 8, line 49; Langsenkamp, col. 2, lines

30-56 and col. 17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67).

13.   As to claim 21, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the method for situation tracking

according to claim 1, and further comprising:

inspecting the alert based on the criteria element at a server, determining a related alert

based on the criteria element, the related alert being related to the alert, adding information from

the related alert to the alert (a data entry, or alert, is received at the database. Upon receipt, it is

determined whether the alert is an update, therefore related to another preexisting alert, or a new

alert. If the alert is an update, this information is added to the existing alert; see Langsenkamp,

col. 21, lines 15-37); and

forwarding the alert to the clearing house from the server (The new alert is transferred to

the Hardware/Software Interface 50 for processing; Langsenkamp, col. 21, lines 15-67).

14.   As to claim 22, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the method for situation tracking

according to claim 1, and further comprising expiring the public safety event based on a statute

of limitation (Brown, col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line18).

15.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown-

Langsenkamp-Chan, as applied above, further in view of Hunt et al., US Pat. No. 5,893,091.

16.   As to claim 6, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach the invention substantially as claimed.

However, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan do not explicitly teach generating the at least one

notification comprising generating at least a portion of one web page based on the selected event

and wherein the destination comprises a web site.

In the analogous field of networked notification systems, Hunt teaches implementing

websites to post notification to users (Hunt, col. 9, line 11 – col. 10, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the use of web pages to notify subscribers, as taught by

Hunt, into the system of Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan for the purpose of increasing notification

delivery efficiency and enhancing delivery options.

17.   Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, US

Pat. No. 6,173,284 B1, in view of Langsenkamp et al., US Pat. No. 5,912,947, in view of Chan et

al., US Pat. App. Pub. No. US 2002/0019941 A1, and further in view of Colgan, US Pat. No.

5,510,978.

18.   As to claim 17, Brown teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Brown teaches a

method for crime tracking comprising:

        communicating an alert to a server (Brown, col. 1, line 21 – col. 2, line 10 and col. 12,

lines 8-45);

        handling a crime event associated with the alert at the server (Brown, col. 5, line 1 – col.

6, line 6);

        generating a notification in response to a subscriber profile and the crime event (Brown,

col. 5, line 1 – col. 6, line 6);

        comparing at least one criteria element associated with a notify criteria associated with

the subscriber profile and at least one event element of the crime event (Brown, col. 7, line 31 –

col. 8, line 49);

determining a match between the notify criteria and the crime event based on the

comparison(Brown, col. 7, line 31 – col. 8, line 49).

However, Brown does not explicitly teach a system and method to determine whether a

subscriber associated with the subscriber profile has access to the matched events based on a

type associated with the subscriber profile.

In the same field of endeavor, Langsenkamp teaches a public notification system and

method wherein a type associated with the subscriber, such as residential subscriber, media, or

business, is used to determine subscriber access to the matched events (see Langsenkamp, col.

17, line 64 – col. 18, line 67 and col. 21, line 15-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the type dependent access as taught by Langsenkamp,

into the emergency notification system of Brown for the purpose of efficiently controlling access

and message distribution.

Brown-Langsenkamp does not explicitly teach the type indicating whether a particular

portion of information concerning the matched public safety event is to be transmitted to the

subscriber in response to receiving a request to access the information from the subscriber. In the

same field of endeavor, Chan teaches restricting and allowing access to portions of information

based on an access control list (ACL) and user privilege information (Chan, page 1, paragraphs

0006-0007 and page 5, paragraph 0057 – page 6, paragraph 0068).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the access control of Chan into the system of Brown-

Langsenkamp in order to enhance data access features.

Further, while Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan teach bi-directional communication between a remote device associated with a police vehicle and a server, Brown-Langsenkamp do not explicitly teach generating an alert from the mobile device associated with the law enforcement vehicle. In the same field of endeavor, Colgan teaches generating an alert from a remote device to update a police databases (Colgan, See Background and Summary, col. 1, line 15 – col. 3, line 42).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the police database updating method, as taught by Colgan, into the system of Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan for the purpose of increasing the timeliness and accuracy of database updates.

19.   As to claim 18, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan-Colgan teaches the method for crime tracking according to claim 17, wherein the alert comprises a type indication, a location indication, a time indication, a date indication and a payload (Brown, col. 7, lines 7-63).

20.   As to claim 19, Brown-Langsenkamp-Chan-Colgan teaches the method for crime tracking according to claim 17, wherein the criteria element and the crime event element comprise a geographic location associated with the crime event (Langsenkamp, col. 12, line 1 – col. 13, line 36).

Response to Arguments

21.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Applicant argued in substance that the type indicating whether a particular portion of

information concerning the matched public safety event is to be transmitted to the subscriber in

response to receiving a request to access the information from the subscriber. The new grounds

of rejection teaches these features.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paul H Kang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6123. The

examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Paul H Kang
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

KENNETH R. COULTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER